

REMARKS

This is in reply to the Office Action dated December 28, 2007. The present application was filed on September 12, 2003 with original claims 1-41. By the present amendment, claims 1, 30, and 40 have been amended. The present Amendment is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination. The claims remaining in the application are claims 1-30 and 33-41. Claims 1, 30 and 40 are independent. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 13-17, were 22-26 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1 and 40 have been amended to more clearly identify the subject matter applicants regard as the invention.

Cole, in contrast, discloses a dual display gaming station. The Cole gaming station first and second displays 34, 36 which are primarily utilized to allow the player to play Class II or Class III games. However, at least one of the displays 34, 36 may be used to display game information and/or non-game information, such as a movie, the Internet, a video feed from another location, or television (see Abstract). The Cole system includes a separate card reader 52 and keypad 140 (in Figure 1) as part of a player tracking system. Furthermore, Cole teaches that the first and/or second display may be utilized during a process which allows the player to create a player tracking account (see paragraph [0096]).

Cole is an integrated system. At least some of the player tracking features of the Cole system may be display on one of the displays 34, 36. As shown in Figure 2, the Cole system includes first and second gaming controllers 102, 104. A master controller 101 handles credit input through a coin acceptor, bill validator, or coupon reader and to initiate a game (see paragraph [0097]). A card reader 52 may be attached to the master controller 101 for reading the player's player tracking card.

Thus, in the Cole system every gaming machine to be used or included in the player tracking system must be configured and have the same hardware as the gaming machine disclosed. Cole provides no mention or teaching of a non-dual station, dual display gaming station integrated into the system.

Applicant: Jeffrey George, et al.

Serial No.: 10/661,128

Group Art Unit: 3714

Furthermore, as shown in Figure 4, the video feed must be connected to a video selector or tuner 114, 130, which is part of the dual station, dual displaying gaming station of Cole. Thus, in order to display video streaming at the Cole gaming station, at least three sets of wires must be run to the game station: a network cable to the master controller 101 and a video line feed to each of the video selectors/tuners 114, 130.

In contrast, the present invention as embodied in independent claims 1, 30 and 40, have been amended to clearly indicate that the player tracking device of the present invention is a device separate and apart from the gaming machines. The gaming machines are capable of running and provided a game to players on their own. Thus, the player tracking device of the present invention may be “added onto” existing gaming machines. The only electrical coupling or connection necessary is to allow the player tracking system to read or modify certain credit meters on the gaming machine to perform player tracking functions. The player tracking device of the present invention is not necessary and does not otherwise interfere with the operation of the gaming machine.

Additionally, the player tracking device of the present invention is networked to the host computer of the player tracking system. Since the player tracking device is so networked it is able to retrieve information from the player tracking system, i.e., account information, as well as receive the video stream over the same network connection (whether the live video feed originates at the host computer or another server on the same network). All streaming video to the player tracking device is communicated through the network to the gaming machine(s). Thus, only one “wire”, i.e., the network connection is required to connect the player tracking device to the host computer and to receive streaming video.

Cole makes no such teaching. Specifically, Cole, *inter alia*, does not teach a player tracking device which includes a player tracking display which selectively displays player tracking information, including total bonus points, session points, and cash play amounts and which a live video feed from a user-selected security camera.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claim 30.

Applicants respectfully assert that Cole does not teach all of the amended independent claims 1 and 30 and therefore the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) is improper and must be withdrawn.

Applicant: Jeffrey George, et al.

Serial No.: 10/661,128

Group Art Unit: 3714

Claims 3, 4, 10, 13-17, 22-26, Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 3, 4, 10, 13-17, 22-26, and 41 are also allowable.

In addition with specific reference to dependent claim 26, applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Specifically, dependent claim 26 requires that the player tracking device confirms that a child of the user is enrolled at a child care facility before a live video feed of the facility is displayed to the user. The Examiner references paragraph [0080] in his rejection. However, paragraph [0080] while discussing a video feed from a child care center, does not include a teaching that the Cole system requires a confirmation that the user has a child at the facility prior to displaying the video.

Claims 2, 5-9, 27,28, and 40-41 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978) in view of Acres et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,961). Claims 2, 5-9, 27, and 28 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. Acres does not overcome the limitation of the Cole reference. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 5-9, 27, and 28 are also allowable.

Independent claim 40 has been amended in a manner similar to independent claims 1 and 30. Specifically, independent claim 40 has been amended to make it clear that the player tracking device is independent of the gaming machine. Furthermore, claim 40 had been amended previously to require that the streaming video is provided over the network connected instead of requiring a separate video feed as in Cole. Acres makes no such teaching. Thus application respectfully assert that independent claim 40 and dependent claim 41 are also allowable.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978) in view of Pease et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,326,104).). Claims 11 and 12 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. Pease does not overcome the limitation of the Cole reference. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 11 and 12 are also allowable.

Applicant: Jeffrey George, et al.

Serial No.: 10/661,128

Group Art Unit: 3714

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978) in view of LeMay et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0032479). Claims 18-21 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. LeMay does not overcome the limitation of the Cole reference. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 18-21 are also allowable.

Claims 29, 30, 33, and 37-39 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978) in view of Squeglia et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156692).).

Claim 29 is ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 1. Squeglia does not overcome the limitation of the Cole reference. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on its own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claim 2, 5-9, 27, and 28 are also allowable.

The Examiner recognizes that Cole does not teach the streaming and display of video on the player tracking display to a user. The Examiner utilizes Squeglia to make such a teaching. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Squeglia teaches a portable unit **14** which must be carried by the user from location to location. Furthermore, the portable unit **14** must be held by the user (see paragraph [0023]). Obviously, Squeglia requires additional hardware, i.e., the portable unit, plus a communications channel which allows the portable unit to communicate with the service shop to receive and transmit information thereto.

Furthermore, neither Cole nor Squeglia teach utilizing the same network connection for player tracking purposes and streaming video so as to reduce the number of physical wired connections to the player tracking device or gaming machine.

In contrast, the present invention utilizes hardware which has been provided for implementing the player tracking system, in particular, the player tracking touchscreen display and after the user, i.e., technician, has logged into the system and been approved, displays the technical instructions via streaming video. No additional hardware is required over what is provided by the player tracking system and no additional communications channel is required.

Applicant: Jeffrey George, et al.

Serial No.: 10/661,128

Group Art Unit: 3714

Applicants respectfully asserts that Squeglia teaches away from the present invention and requires additional hardware and a new communications channel.

Since neither Cole nor Squeglia include all of the limitations of independent claim 30, applicants respectfully asserts that the §102(e) rejection of independent claim 30 is improper and must be withdrawn. Claims 33, and 37-39 are dependent upon allowable independent claim 30. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that based on the argument above, and based on their own merits, claims 33 and 37-39 are also allowable.

Claims 34-36 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137978) in view of Squeglia et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156692) and further in view of Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 5,611,730). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 34-36 are ultimately dependent upon allowable independent claim 30. Weiss does not overcome the deficiencies of Cole and Squeglia. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that based on the argument above, and based on their own merits, claims 33 and 37-39 are also allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. The proper fee for a three-month extension of time is submitted herewith. If any additional fees are necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2789 in the name of Howard & Howard. Further and favorable reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

/James R. Yee/

Date: June 30, 2008

James R. Yee, Registration No. 34,460
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 723-0349